

Maricopa County Community Services Commission
Maricopa County Human Services Department
234 N. Central, 3rd Floor Arizona Conference Room
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Monday, May 18, 2009
2:00 P.M.

Meeting Minutes

Members Present:

City of Glendale - Councilman Steve Frate
Low-Income Representative - Sister Barbara Webster
Low Income Representative- Glenn Cuzzort
Valley of the Sun United Way- Amy Schwabenlender
The Salvation Army – David Clitheroe
Town of Gila Bend - Mayor Fred Hull

City of Avondale - Rogene Hill
Salt River Project- Bonnie Temme
City of Tolleson – Councilwoman Kathie Farr
APS - Louise Moskowitz
Chicanos Por La Causa- Terri Cruz
Society of St. Vincent de Paul - Jerry Castro

Presenters/Staff/Guests Present:

Staff:

Margarita Leyvas
Eileen Hartnett
Cecelia Robles
Frances Delgado
Yvonne Seel

Guests:

Anthony Sissons & Eddie Sissons, Research Advisory
Services, Inc.
Sylvia Sheffield, City of Avondale
Mary Hutchinson & Beth Fiorenza, TCAA
Racel Aleman, Community Services of Arizona

- 1. Call to Order** The meeting was called to order at 2:00 PM by Chair Louise Moskowitz.
- 2. Roll Call** Frances Delgado called roll and a quorum was established.
- 3. Opening Prayer** Amy Schwabenlender led the prayer.
- 4. Pledge of Allegiance** Councilman Steve Frate led the Pledge of Allegiance.
- 5. Approval of Minutes** Steve Frate made a motion to accept the minutes of the April 27, 2009 meeting. The motion was seconded by Fred Hull. The vote was unanimous and the motion carried.
- 6. Director's Report** Marge Leyvas stated the following:
 - The FY2010 budget projections do not favor human and social services.
 - Arizona Community Action Agencies joined together and were successful in having 100% of the administrative cost for LIHEAP weatherization passed through to the CAA's from the Department of Commerce Energy Office for SFY2010..
 - Provided an overview of the Commission's task following the presentation at today's meeting. The Commission's thorough consideration and transparency in decision-making is critical. She distributed Conflict of Interest Statement forms, reviewed the form, and asked Commissioners to sign and return.
 - The Commission's task is to develop a recommendation or recommendations to be forwarded to the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors, which will make the final decisions.

7. Call to the Public

No cards for public comment were submitted.

8. Presentation – Research Advisory Services

Tony and Eddie Sissons presented recommended elements for consideration in the continuation or change of the boundaries and service delivery systems of the Maricopa County Community Services Areas. A scoring sheet was provided the Commissioners for use only in making notes for discussion, not to be shared.

A powerpoint was presented along with handouts. As the presentation proceeded, Commissioners asked questions and requested clarification of elements.

- Major Clitheroe asked for clarification on what the change elements are. Tony Sissons answered that rather than develop scenarios, they came up with various elements that could be used separately or in conjunction with other elements, and that the Commission would determine which elements were to be recommended to the MC BOS for implementation.
- Jerry Castro asked if the Commission is to consider only financial assistance, or all services. Marge Leyvas answered that the Commission should look at the entire contract service, which is inclusive of emergency assistance, case management, as well as community services.
- Bonnie Temme asked why Fountain Hills is assigned to the Tempe area, when it borders Scottsdale. Marge replied that the City of Scottsdale does not ask for operating funds from Maricopa County, and they serve only residents within their city limits.
- Major Clitheroe asked how the Indian Communities fit in. Marge answered that the tribes receive their own allocations directly from DHHS.
- After viewing recommendations of consolidations of several service areas, Councilman Steve Frate asked if there would be one or two offices in combined, larger service areas. Marge answered with a caution, that we are only discussing the service areas, not taking into consideration the current provider, as that may change. The Division can dictate via contract that either itinerant services are made available or if there should be multiple offices.
- Commissioners wanted to know the service areas population of low-income with the combined areas. Information was calculated and provided.
- There was a discussion on the current boundaries of Tolleson, and the responsibilities of staff of that CAP office.
- Rogene Hill asked about annexed areas and County islands. Marge explained that County General funds are provided to the current contractors so that they can serve residents of the county islands.
- In the discussion of the consolidation of the MC3 and MC6 Service Areas, Commissioners asked why would there be a plan to consolidate if there is no cost savings? However, Commissioners were reminded that cost savings related to current service providers cannot be assumed.
- Amy Schwabenlender asked what “eligibility heavy” programs are. Response - Programs that are related to direct financial assistance usually have great and more comprehensive requirements.
- Related to the element of deploying master staff, Jerry Castro asked if there are Master Staff now who are being utilized? Response - Yes, the Division has a staff whose duties include activities as a “roving case manager” to assist with application intake at agencies whose staff are on leave, excessive demand for services, or smaller staff. However, increased need in the community results in increased load at the Division administrative end, so sending out Division staff can result in another shortage here at the Division.
- Related to the recommendation of a centralized intake system, Jerry Castro

asked how the data entry would be done, if the public call-in here? Marge explained the HSD Online system, and that it is web accessible; however an application is not started until all required paperwork has been provided, reviewed, and copied. Another question was on the capacity of the telephone system at the Department. Response - An analysis would have to be done on the internal capability of the telephone system.

- Chair Louise Moskowitz asked if there would be an opportunity to hear about best practices, as well as recommendations from the Division. Tony Sissons indicated he had done interviews with each of the CAP Directors, and that there were no new, profound changes that were suggested from this population. However, because each area and agency is unique, there were varied strengths and challenges for each. Marge indicated that the CAP agencies have set-ups that best suit their population and communities. As examples: Glendale has a densely populated area, and therefore does group information sessions. Gila Bend CAP is more individually-based as their population is much smaller. They all work to address the needs of their individual communities.
- Major Clitheroe posed the question to the Commission that cutting cost may lead to sacrifice of service, and that needs to be considered. Marge indicated that 100% of eligible populations are not currently served and will not be served based on levels of funding, and not all eligible households request services. Marge also shared information on the current funding formula - the \$75,000 base, with balance of funding based on share of poverty population at 125% of the FPL. She further stated that the County does not fully fund any CAP agency; all must have other sources of revenue, whether in-kind or cash, in order to sustain the program.
- Chair Louise Moskowitz asked that staff prepare information on the elements, on what staff believes may or may not work and prepare recommendations for the Commission.
- Glenn Cuzzort raised concern that based on the data for Chandler and Gilbert CAPs, combining the two would create a very large area.

There was a break from 4:05pm until 4:25 pm. The Chair cautioned all Commissioners not to discuss any agenda items/business during the break.

- Chair Louise Moskowitz asked each Commission member to share their initial thoughts and reactions to the elements and recommendations presented.
- Vice Mayor Kathie Farr, city of Tolleson, said her initial reaction was to be against a combination of Avondale and Tolleson but the facts (Tolleson CAP activities) present a case for this. She also strongly supports the idea of letting the CAP agencies "be CAP's."
- Mayor Fred Hull said there are many elements here, and more detail is needed. He asked if a video capability was something to be considered, and was interested in more detail on a centralization scenario. Volunteer-based operations may work in larger communities, but they won't be effective in smaller communities like Gila Bend. Regarding the recommendation on Commission term limits - Term limits may be a good idea, however in some communities there is only one person interested in serving this Commission.
- Glenn Cuzzort was in favor of all of the recommended combinations of service areas except for Gilbert and Chandler. He expressed concern over large geographic area and population, and where an easily accessible central office would be located.
- Sister Barbara Webster expressed her main concern that people in need must continue to be the priority in terms of service and accessibility.
- Jerry Castro indicated he felt that elements 3, 4 and 5 had potential; he is not convinced of element 8 with the master staff, and 9 may also be a possibility.
- Councilman Frate was supportive of elements 1 through 5; elements 6 – 9 seem to be out of the comfort zone for this business, and he would need more details on how these would be implemented.

- Bonne Temme said that 3, 4 and 5 have potential, in being sensitive to geographical areas; the master staff element has merit and should be considered more thoroughly.
- Major David Clitheroe is supportive of consolidating where appropriate, but does not think the one or two central locations would be feasible.
- Amy Schwabenlender would like more discussion around the priorities in making the determination. It is difficult to make any recommendations without knowing the ultimate goals and financial support information. Elements 2 through 5 have potential; 6 and 7, she is not sure where they are in terms of priority, and element 9 is worthy of more discussion.
- Rogene Hill indicated the multi-year contracts were a positive recommendation, and is not in favor of element 1 which is to make no changes. She stated the Division should try to integrate technology into service delivery in any way possible. She felt master staff may not be a long term solution but would be helpful in addressing back logs and overflow. She is not convinced of Element 9 at this time, but maybe will be a stronger element further down the road.
- Teri Cruz felt that the last element is the last one that should be considered, customer service and being available to people in need has to be the priority. She's concerned about the clients in these scenarios, and technology can be useful but a lot of people cannot use it and have no experience with it. One-to-one services would be best, and telephone intakes should be out.
- Chair Louise Moskowitz appreciates all of the information provided by the RAC but needs more information in order to make some decisions. She recognizes the need to change with the times, and supports some of the consolidation elements. She would like more information on what the impacts of the consolidations and other elements would be. She supports multi-year contracts, and term limits, but doesn't want to lose experienced Commission members.
- Marge shared that the MC4 service areas has been serviced directly by MCHSD, via one case worker. In FY10, we will provide itinerant services there, using various spaces to see clients and take applications.

9. Determination of Recommendation

- Teri Cruz made a motion to table action on a recommendation. Mayor Fred Hull seconded; all approved and the agenda action item was tabled.

10. Board Remarks

- None.

11. Adjournment

- Chairwoman Louise Moskowitz called for a motion to adjourn. Sister Barbara Webster made a motion to adjourn. Teri Cruz seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 pm.